



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/648,676	05/16/96	LEADER	M 2227-006

BRUCE W GREENHAUS  
BAKER MAXHAM JESTER & MEADOR  
750 B STREET SUITE 3100  
SAN DIEGO CA 92101

A1M1/1106

EXAMINER	
TUNG, T	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1102	8

DATE MAILED:

11/06/97

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☒ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run \_\_\_\_\_ or continues to run \_\_\_\_\_ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☒ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☐ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 10-30-97 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☒ The proposed amendments to the claim and /or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
  - ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
  - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
  - ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
  - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: the newly-proposed expression "diameter in the range of about 0.002-0.006 inches"  
would tend to raise new issues.

2. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☐ will be entered ☒ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: none  
Claims objected to: none  
Claims rejected: 1-17

However;

☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because the combination of references is still deemed to be proper. The contention that Paces 978 and Brown do not show a thru-hole in the substrate is without merit. In '978 the substrate is 3, the opening occupied by conductor 2
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☒ Other  
is a thru-hole. In Brown, element 25 can be construed as the substrate, which clearly has a thru-hole. Still considered to be obvious for Better to adopt a Thru-hole directly under the anode. One advantage would be locating the conductor lead away from exposure to the sample.

PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89)

T. TUNG  
PRIMARY PATENT EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 112